

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments Summary

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-16, 18-21, 24 and 27-43 are now pending. Claims 1, 5-7, 13-16, 18, 19 and 24 are amended herein. Claims 4, 12 and 25 are cancelled herein; claims 17, 22, 23 and 26 were previously cancelled. Claims 27-43 are newly presented and for which basis can be found in the application as originally filed. Of the claims, only claims 1, 18, 19, 20, 24 and 27 are independent.

Claim 1 is amended to include the features of previous claim 4. Claims 5-7 are amended to correct their dependencies. Claims 13-16 are amended to depend from claim 18. Claim 19 is amended to include the feature that the second skin is a preformed plastics layer. Support for this amendment can be found in the example described in the specification as filed at page 6, first paragraph. Claim 24 is amended to include the features of claim 25. New claim 27 is similar to claims 1 and 18, and new claims 28-41 depend from claim 27.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C 102 & 35. U.S.C. 103

In the Office Action, claims 12, 18, 19, 20, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,312,908 to Jasperson; claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/02007140 to Minke et al.; claims 1-5 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Jasperson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,997 to Chen; claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Jasperson in view of Chen and further in view of Minke et al.; and claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Jasperson in view of Minke et al. It is respectfully submitted that the rejections be withdrawn for the following reasons.

As described in the specification, the present invention relates to a radically different way of manufacturing doors, windows and panels compared with previously known methods.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is amended herein to incorporate the features of claim 4. Claim 1, as amended, requires that a precursor is made and is subsequently modified prior to the application of a second skin. In this way, the manufacture of doors, windows and panels can be improved as described in the present application.

In the Office Action, claim 4 was rejected as being obvious over Jasperson in view of Chen. Jasperson describes a method of making composite elements. In the example referred to by the Examiner, at column 7, line 37 to column 8, line 17 of Jasperson, a composite product is made including a core having plywood on one side and a concrete coating on the other side. There is nothing in Jasperson to disclose or suggest modifying a precursor prior to attaching a second skin.

Chen describes a conventional method of making a door or panel which comprises two molded skins attached to a frame. A core material, for example a plastic foam, is filled into the frame to form the door or panel. This is a known type of method which is described at page 1, paragraphs 4 and 5, of the specification, where problems with such a method are also described.

The Examiner referred to Figures 7 and 8 of Chen as showing a “precursor”, but it is respectfully submitted that that interpretation is not correct. It can clearly be seen from the description of Figures 7 and 8 that these figures show an “exploded cross section” (see column 2, lines 46 to 53 of Chen) and not a core having one skin to which a second skin is subsequently attached. Indeed it is clear, for example, from consideration of column 2, lines 7 to 16 of Chen, that the foam core is filled into the cavity between the skins.

Thus, it is submitted that claim 1, as amended herein, is not anticipated by or found obvious over the disclosures of Jasperson and Chen. Since claims 2, 3 and 5-11 and 43 ultimately depend on claim 1, and therefore include all the features of claim 1, it is submitted that these claims or not anticipated by or found obvious over the disclosures of Jasperson and Chen.

Claim 19

Claim 19 recites a kit for making a door, window or panel, the kit including a precursor comprising a skin attached to one face of an open cell foam, but not to an opposing face of the open cell foam, and a second skin that is not attached to the precursor. Claim 19 is amended herein to include the feature that the second skin comprises a preformed plastics element.

As discussed above, the Examiner referred to the example at column 7, line 37, to column 8, line 16 of Jasperson, which describes the application of a plywood layer to one side of a core, and a concrete coating to the other. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Jasperson of a precursor, as defined in claim 19, with a preformed plastics skin. Indeed, it is submitted that Jasperson teaches against such a method: it is noted that in the method described at column 8, lines 6 to 14, it is described how two door skins are applied to opposite sides of a door. This is the conventional method, for example as described in the introduction of the present application in the paragraph beginning on page 1, line 29, and ending on page 2, line 2.

In Chen, as discussed above, the method described is the conventional method of injecting a foam in between two molded skins on a frame. Similarly, in Minke et al., the method described relates to material being inserted into a door cavity between two door skins 18, 20. Thus there is nothing in any of the cited documents which would lead the person skilled in the art to the claimed invention.

Thus it is submitted that claim 19, as amended herein, is not anticipated by or found obvious over the cited references. Claim 21 depends on claim 19 and therefore includes all the features of claim 19. It is therefore submitted that claim 21 is not anticipated by or found obvious over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 19.

Claims 18, 20, 24 and 27

Claim 18 defines a method of forming a door, window or panel in which two precursors are attached together, each precursor comprising a core having a skin. Claim 20 defines a kit including the first and second precursors, and claim 24 relates to the formed door, window or panel in the case in which the precursors have been joined using an adhesive. New claim 27 defines a method of forming a door, window or panel in the two precursors are formed by attaching first and second skins to foam. The precursors are subsequently joined to form the door, window or panel.

It is submitted that there is no disclosure or suggestion in any of the documents cited by the Examiner of a method or product including two precursors, each including a foam and an attached skin, as required by amended claim 18, claim 20, amended claim 24 and new claim 27.

The Examiner rejected previous claim 18 as being anticipated by Jasperson. It is respectfully submitted that claim 18, as amended herein, is not anticipated by Jasperson for the following reasons. There is nothing in Jasperson which discloses two precursors, each including a foam and a skin. Indeed, as indicated above, Jasperson teaches against the use of such precursors. In the example described at column 8 lines 6 to 17 of Jasperson, two skins are adhered to opposite sides of a single core. This is the conventional method which is described in the introduction of the present application. There is nothing in Jasperson to suggest to the person skilled in the art to apply a skin to each of two foam elements as required by claim 18. Since claims 13-16 depend from claim 18, it is submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Jasperson.

Claims 20 and 24 were rejected as being anticipated by Jasperson. Claims 20 and 24 contain similar features to claim 18. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Jasperson for at least the same reasons as claim 18. Since claim 42 depends from claim 20 it is respectfully submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Jasperson.

New claim 27 contains similar features to claim 18. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Jasperson for at least the same reasons as claim 18. Furthermore,

since claims 28-40 depend from claim 27, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are not anticipated by Jasperson.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are allowable. It is respectfully submitted that the rejections to the claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response to the Office Action has been made. The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any further questions or concerns, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney/agent.

A Petition for Extension of Time of three (3) months and the corresponding fee payment are submitted herewith. If any additional fees are occasioned by this Response, the Director is hereby authorized to charge them to, or to credit, Deposit Account 08-2442 of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
HODGSON RUSS LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: September 10, 2009

By: /rachel s. watt#46186/
Rachel S. Watt
Reg. No. 46,186

HODGSON RUSS LLP
The Guaranty Building
140 Pearl Street, Suite 100
Buffalo, New York 14202-4040
Tel: (716) 856-4000